



LANCELL.002CP1

Election/EXT(1)/#6
J 8.27.02
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Carol O. Cowing
Appl. No. : 09/809,158
Filed : March 15, 2001
For : METHOD TO ENHANCE THE
IMMUNOGENICITY OF AN
ANTIGEN
Examiner : Ungar, S.

Group Art Unit 1642

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

This is in response to Office Action, mailed June 18, 2002 (paper no. 5). Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous Office Action.

Independent Inventions Restriction

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant elects with traverse, Group I (claims 1-14, 18-24, 27-47 and 51-57).

The Examiner also indicated that Group I was further subject to election of a single species comprising different lipophilic molecules, which are represented by the generic formulas (1), (2) and (3) recited in Claims 3 and 36. Applicant elects the species set forth in structure (2). Applicant respectfully traverses the species election, because only three closely related generic structures are disclosed. They are linked by generic claims 2 and 35, respectively.

The Examiner also indicated that Groups I-III were further subject to election of a single species of methods of introducing the antigen, which species are set forth in claims 18-24 and 54-56. Applicant elects the species set forth in claim 21. Applicant respectfully traverses the species election with respect to claims 18-24, because only six species of well-known methods of

• Appl. No. : 809,158
Filed : March 15, 2001

introducing are disclosed and they are all encompassed by the introducing step of generic Claim 1.

The Examiner also indicated that Groups I-IV were further subject to election of a single species of antigen, which "species" are both set forth in claim 27 as (a) normal and (b) pathologic antigens. Applicant elects the "pathologic" species of antigen.

The Examiner also indicated that Groups I-V were further subject to election of a single species wherein the topical treatment has different effects on function, which different effects are set forth in claims 28-31. Applicant elects the species set forth in claim 28. Applicant respectfully traverses the species election with respect to claims 28-31, because only three species of different effects on function are disclosed and the specification teaches (see, pg. 28-29, paragraphs (1)-(6)) that each of these effects may occur and be monitored as related criteria of success (i.e., the objective of the invention). In other words, the effects are not mutually exclusive.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 8/9/02

By: Mark R. Benedict

Mark R. Benedict
Registration No. 44,531
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(949) 760-0404

O:\DOCS\MXG\MXG-1476.DOC
080802